



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

BY THE HON. WARNER MILLER AND THE HON. RICHARD P.  
BLAND.

---

## I.

It seldom happens that differences existing between political parties are such as to raise the question of loyalty, on the part of either, to the fundamental principles of our government.

Parties usually divide on matters of administration, on revenue and method of producing it, on the powers of the general government and the rights of the several States.

But once in our history has any political party been disloyal, and then the majority of that party in the Northern States rallied to the support of the government, and gave invaluable aid in the contest for its preservation.

A government may be as certainly destroyed or revolutionized by peaceable methods through the ballot box as by war.

Our government is not paternal; it gives the largest amount of liberty to each individual consistent with the general welfare; it protects individuals in the exercise of political and religious liberty; it has made it easier for our citizens to acquire and hold property than under any other form of government; it protects the right of private contract among its people by constitutional provisions; it treats its citizens honestly and demands that they shall be honest with the government and with each other.

To protect the people against possible usurpation of power by either the legislative or the executive departments of the government it has provided a court of last resort, which shall judge of the acts of both of these departments and determine whether they are in conformity with the Constitution. This court is a most important part of our system.

Legislatures come and go, executives serve a fixed and limited term, but the Supreme Court, while changing its individual members, will continue in an unbroken line as long as the government shall exist. It is the real guardian of our rights and liberties as set forth in the Constitution.

All these principles of government are at issue in the present campaign. For the first time in our history a political party has openly proposed to debase and cheapen our currency ; for the first time the right of private contract is condemned and laws are demanded to prevent it ; in certain cases for the first time the Supreme Court is attacked and its re-organization threatened ; for the first time the demand is made that private property shall be taken for public use without proper compensation.

The party which met in convention early in July, miscalled the Democratic party, threatens the country, if successful, with all of these evils.

The Populist party, which met in St. Louis a few days later, not only endorsed all that was done at Chicago, but went still farther in its attack upon our system of government as it has existed from the beginning, and pronounced against the preservation of law and order, and the safety of our property and people through the regularly established and heretofore unquestioned functions of our government.

Mr. Bryan was nominated for the presidency at both of these conventions. It has been said that he secured the nomination at Chicago by his oratory, but this is a mistake ; that convention was dominated absolutely by the Populistic sentiment which had gained control of the organization of the Democratic party, and it nominated Mr. Bryan because he was a Populist and not a Democrat of the old school. The Populist Convention at St. Louis nominated him because he was the real leader of their party, and more than any other man represented their theories of government. If any proof is needed of this statement let his speeches in Congress, his speeches on the stump in his own State, and his editorial writings furnish the evidence.

The Populist Convention failed to endorse as its candidate for Vice-President Mr. Sewall, who had been put in nomination at Chicago, because he was not a Populist, or at least had up to that time never given any evidence of his being a believer in their doctrines.

Opposed to this candidate and to his Populistic principles we have William McKinley, nominated at a Republican Convention held in St. Louis early in June. The history of the Republican party from its organization down to the present time is a sufficient guarantee of its continued loyalty to the principles of our Constitution, but in this emergency it has spoken upon all of these questions with no uncertain sound.

The candidate himself has made a record during his long years of public service which is a sufficient pledge that the principles of his party, as laid down in the platform adopted at St. Louis, will be honestly and fearlessly carried out in his administration, and in public speech since his nomination he has given pledges of his support of the platform.

The proposition to debase and cheapen our money is found in the demand of the Populists for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. The avowed object of this is to scale down all the debts both national and private 50 per cent.

In the war for the preservation of the Union we contracted a national debt of nearly three thousand millions of dollars; we borrowed this money upon the best terms that we could, the rate depending from day to day upon the success or defeat of the Union armies, and the faith of the world as to our success.

We pledged the world that we would pay our debt in the honest money of the world. When the war closed some faint-hearted and dishonest people advised the repudiation of the entire debt; others quite as dishonest at heart, but not so bold in statement, demanded that the debt should be paid in greenbacks or fiat money; but the loyal men of our country vastly outnumbered the dishonest cowards, and we have gone on paying our debt and interest in gold or its equivalent, until to-day less than one-third of the debt remains to be liquidated.

After this record for honesty and fair dealing shall we scale down the remainder of the debt to 50 cents on the dollar, and thus forever tarnish and blacken our record as a people?

The Populist platform demands that the government shall be permitted to liquidate this debt in a depreciated currency. We still owe a great debt to the soldiers of the late war in the form of pensions. Shall we scale down that debt also to 50 cents on the dollar? That is what the Populists demand. Or shall we continue

to pay these pensions in the same money with which we have paid our bonds and the interest ?

The Republican party in its platform and Mr. McKinley in his public speeches have declared against the free coinage of silver and for the maintenance of currency upon a parity with gold.

This silver question reduces itself to a simple matter of common honesty between the government and its people and between private individuals.

If an individual fails in business, and is not able to pay his debts in full he may make a compromise with his creditors, if they are willing to accept it, of fifty cents on the dollar, or for any other amount that may be mutually agreed upon ; but this is a proposition to make such a compromise by the force of law.

Those who are in favor of that course will support the Populists and Mr. Bryan, but those who are in favor of honesty cannot do otherwise than support Mr. McKinley for President.

The proposition of Mr. Bryan for the free coinage of silver or the making of a fifty-cent dollar is only half the truth of what he and his followers propose.

Mr. Bryan as a member of Congress recommended the issuing of fiat money by the government upon the ground that the people would save, first, the interest upon the money, and, secondly, if the money was not redeemed that they would save the principal also ; and the Populist Convention at St. Louis demanded that the general government should issue fiat money ; it should be full legal tender for all debts both public and private, and that "efficient means should be furnished for its distribution direct to the people." This is nothing more nor less than repudiation of all the debts of the government.

The payment of the debts of the government by the issuing of fiat money, without provision for its redemption in coin, is simple robbery under the forms of law. Can there be any question as to where our loyal citizens would stand upon such a proposition ? There should be none, and I do not believe there is.

The attack upon the integrity of the Supreme Court is even more dangerous than the attack upon the currency.

This court is removed from the influence of partisan strife as absolutely as any body of men can be. It has always held the respect and confidence of the people ; and its decisions have been received and obeyed as the supreme law of the land.

The attack upon it is based upon two acts—the declaration of the late income tax law as unconstitutional and the use of the court for the suppression of a great riot known as the “Debs Riot.”

The action of the United States Court in the matter of the Debs Riot has been condemned by every Anarchist, every Socialist, every Communist, and every Populist in the country.

What are the facts?

A great riot took place in Chicago; the United States mails were stopped and all inter-State commerce passing through that great city was suspended; the Governor of the State refused to do his duty because he was in sympathy with the rioters; the Mayor of the city failed to do his duty for the same reason; the federal government was appealed to to protect the carrying of the mails and to enable inter-State commerce to be carried on without interruption.

The court, through the proper exercise of its powers, forbade all persons from interfering with the movement of the mails and with commerce, and when the rioters failed to obey that order, the President of the United States, exercising his just powers under the Constitution, ordered out the army of the United States, suppressed the riot, arrested the leaders, moved the mails, and set the wheels of inter-State commerce in motion.

Had this not been done the riot would have succeeded; it would doubtless have grown into a civil war; it would have destroyed Chicago and untold millions of property of the citizens of the United States, and doubtless thousands of lives would have been sacrificed.

In suppressing this riot and demonstrating the power of the federal government to protect its own people and their rights President Cleveland performed an act which, in my judgment, will, in the centuries to come, do more for the preservation and maintenance of our institutions than any single act of any President since the close of the late Civil War.

As the population of this country increases, its discordant elements, the Anarchists and the Socialists of the old world, will doubtless come here in larger numbers than ever before, and under our free system of public discussion and public agitation they will attempt more and more to spread their doctrines among our people; then this power of the federal government to protect itself,

its citizens, and its functions will of necessity be called into action, and the course followed by President Cleveland at Chicago will be a sufficient precedent for all future administrations.

Can any patriotic American citizen hesitate as to whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who stands for the defence of our liberties through the Supreme Court, or whether he shall give his suffrage to the man who condemns the Supreme Court and upholds the right of riot and civil discord ?

In both the platforms, the one adopted at Chicago and the one adopted by the Populists at St. Louis, the right of private contract is attacked and a demand made that laws shall be passed limiting it. This right has always been sustained by our courts ; it is a right of the very highest importance to the private citizen, and should be maintained at any cost or sacrifice.

McKinley stands for the inviolability of contracts ; Bryan stands for all that is opposed to that principle.

The Populists demand that the government shall take and operate our railroads ; if the government takes the railroads it must exercise the right of eminent domain.

The Constitution provides that private property shall not be taken for public use except by just compensation to the owner.

The value of our railroads is a vast sum—some three or four times more than the entire national debt at the close of the war.

They are owned, not by a few people ; but hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of our people are interested in the stock and bonds of these corporations. The government cannot pay for them in money, unless it creates fiat money and compels the present owners of these railroads to take it.

If it issues bonds it cannot compel the owners of the railroad securities to exchange them for the government bonds ; it must put its bonds upon the market and sell them to the highest bidder and pay for the railroads with the money thus secured. No one having knowledge of finance believes for a moment that this can be done. There remains no way by which the government can take these railroads except by confiscation and by compelling the present owners to accept fiat money for the securities which they now hold.

When we speak of this as a dishonest transaction we use mild terms ; it is simply robbery committed by the power of a great government which no private citizen is able to resist.

The theories of the Populists are only partially discussed in their platform. Associated with them are all the discordant, dissatisfied elements in society; the Anarchist naturally turns to that party, and the Socialist and Communist also naturally turn to it. No one is far-sighted enough to properly describe what would be the condition of society if all the powers and functions of this great government were given into their hands. It certainly would produce a revolution in our government through the ordinary forms of law, which would leave not one of the principles established by our fathers, and confirmed again and again through the laws of Congress and the decisions of the Supreme Court.

If we believe, then, that this government is the best the world has ever known thus far; if we believe that our liberties, lives, and property are safe under it, we must of necessity, laying aside all partisanship, give our support to the candidate who by his life and public acts, and by the declarations of his party, which he has adopted, gives us an absolute guarantee that in his hands and under his administration the honor and integrity of the country will be safe, and that the rights and liberties of our private citizens will be maintained.

WARNER MILLER.

---

## II.

THERE are many reasons why Mr. Bryan should be elected, and why the Democratic platform should be enforced as the policy of this government. His election would mean a complete change in the legislation and administration of affairs. The policies of the government would be taken from the old ruts and re-established upon pure Democratic lines. It would mean the displacement of the classes who have heretofore controlled legislation and the establishment of the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

It is charged that the Democratic platform is dishonest; that the aims and purposes of the party that proclaimed this platform and nominated the candidates upon it are dishonest and revolutionary. But, in reviewing the political situation and the condition of the two parties, the people may judge as to the facts relative to the matter of dishonesty and revolution. On the



one hand, it was gravely charged and asserted by a distinguished United States Senator, Mr. Chandler, that the manager of Mr. McKinley, Mark Hanna, had extorted, or endeavored to extort, from certain classes of our people, a quarter of a million of dollars, to be expended as a fund to secure the nomination of Mr. McKinley at St. Louis. That grave complaints were made by the friends of other Republican candidates for the presidential nomination against Mr. Hanna, on the same ground, is a matter of political history that cannot be disputed. And since the nomination of Mr. McKinley, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. Hanna, has proclaimed his committees appointed for the purpose of raising a campaign fund to secure the election of the Republican nominee. The men in New York who constitute this campaign fund committee represent an aggregate wealth of over \$500,000,000. The men in Chicago representing this campaign committee, or the committee to raise funds for the campaign, represent an aggregate wealth of over \$100,000,000. Among the persons designated as members of this committee may be found men known to be the heads of trusts, combines, and monopolies, and who have amassed enormous wealth by the advantages they have gained in legislation, not only in the federal government, but in the various State governments and municipalities in which they are located.

As a further evidence of the classes who are behind and giving force and effect to the Republican campaign, it may be stated that at the Madison Square Garden meeting, the other night, at which Mr. Bourke Cockran spoke, there were vice-presidents on the platform with the speaker claiming to be Democrats, but who were cheering all the while for Mr. McKinley, who are publicly known to be at the head of many trusts and combinations against which Congress has fulminated its laws, and which laws have heretofore been a dead letter upon the statute books.

Who are the parties leading the Democracy in this campaign? The public will not fail to note the fact that some of the men who have bolted the Chicago platform and the nominees are notoriously the beneficiaries of trusts, including the Standard Oil Trust, and many others of less importance that may be named. Indeed, the Chicago platform and nominees are a standing menace to combinations, to monopolies, and the favored few

who have enriched themselves at the expense of the masses of the American people. On the platform with Mr. Cockran, and on the committee to raise funds for McKinley, may be noted the men and the syndicates, and their sympathizers, who in one bond issue alone robbed the people of this country of over \$10,000,000. And on these committees to raise campaign funds may be noted the men who have taken control of the beef market of this country and dominate the prices to be paid to producers of cattle, as well as to the consumers of beef—the men who have sturdily resisted the demands of labor for fair wages, and who have used all their power to crush labor organizations and to degrade the common people of this country.

That the Republican party represents all the trusts, combinations, and other systems of class legislation and robbery that have existed in this country for a quarter of a century is a matter of political history that no man can deny. When we see the men who are the beneficiaries of class legislation and monopoly, without regard to party, whether Democrats or Republicans—the men who have heretofore claimed to be Democrats—all combining to fight the Democratic platform and the Democratic nominees, it is an object lesson that the American people will not fail to observe and to be governed by. Therefore, as I stated in the beginning, the election of Mr. Bryan would mean the displacement of these favored classes, their dethronement from control and domination of public affairs, and the re-establishment of our government upon the principles of Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln, as a “government of the people, by the people, and for the people,” instead of, as it has existed in recent years, a government of the classes, by the classes, and for the classes. The idea of the beneficiaries of the bond issues for the past few years, who have squeezed the government and robbed the people of millions of dollars, setting themselves up as tutors and exemplars of honesty, in politics or anything else, is a spectacle for gods and men. And yet it was to this class and this element that the Hon. Bourke Cockran, in his celebrated speech at Madison Square Garden, in pretended answer to Mr. Bryan, appealed, because they constituted his audience in the main, and were the promoters of his enterprise.

The American people are beginning to understand that this movement for the election of Mr. Bryan, on the principles of

the Chicago platform, means the restoration of this government to the hands of the plain people of this country ; and hence the war now being made upon this movement by the beneficiaries of class legislation. It is true that the currency question is the dominant issue in this campaign. But it is also true that, aside from this question, the people believe that the election of Mr. Bryan means more than simply the restoration of silver, or the reformation of our currency. It means a complete, radical, and absolute change in the policies of administration, as I have stated.

What would be accomplished by the election of Mr. McKinley ? Merely the continuation of existing conditions which have prevailed for many years past under Republican rule, as well as under the policies of the present administration. All parties insist that our present financial condition is deplorable ; all admit that the present condition of our country is unsatisfactory to the people. They insist that there should be a change, a radical change, in the present depressed condition of our industrial population. Should Mr. McKinley be elected, he is pledged by the St. Louis platform to maintain the single gold standard. The policy of the Republican party is boldly declared to be for the maintenance of the single gold standard, at all hazards. How is this standard to be maintained ? We know that during Mr. Cleveland's administration, in order to carry out the policy inaugurated by the Republican party, and maintained by the present administration, upon the financial question, there has been saddled upon the people of this country a bonded debt of \$262,000,000. We are constantly driven to the necessity of borrowing money from Europe, in order to maintain for us the same monetary policy as prevails in Europe. Will Mr. McKinley continue the issue of bonds ; and if not, what will be his policy upon this subject ? It is true that, pending the campaign, the representatives of the bond syndicates of Europe and this country, whether they call themselves Democrats or Republicans, for political purposes, have ceased their raids upon the Treasury, and now pretend to be engaged in the patriotic work of maintaining the gold reserve so as to prevent the exporting of gold to Europe. But no one doubts that, like Bob Acres's courage, this "patriotism" will "ooze out" the moment Mr. McKinley is elected, and their raids upon the Treasury gold will be renewed

with great vigor in the fall. What will Mr. McKinley do to procure the gold to meet these demands? His party has denounced the administration of Mr. Cleveland for the issuance of bonds, and especially because they declared that the policy of his administration had been such as to prevent revenues from getting into the Federal Treasury, to meet the demands of these gold raiders in Europe and the United States. The American people want to know, and it is an interesting question to propound to Mr. McKinley and the Republican party: How are you going to procure the gold to meet what the gold gamblers of this country declare to be "gold demands"—that is, our greenbacks and Treasury notes? It will not do to answer this question, as it has been attempted to be answered by some of the Republicans, that taxes will be raised to such a point as to secure a surplus fund in the Treasury to meet these demands. Our present tariff is within the lines of protection. If it is raised higher, it will probably exclude revenue instead of raising revenue. Our Republican friends will hardly go before the country insisting that they will put the tariff on a purely revenue basis, in order to secure greater revenue to the federal Treasury; and unless they do that, there is no possibility of any tariff legislation increasing our revenues.

But, aside from the question as to whether our taxes are to be increased or not, another matter to be considered is: In what sort of funds or money shall taxes be paid? We have no taxes to-day paid in gold, and gold only. Our customs' taxes may be paid in silver dollars, or silver certificates, and are, under the ruling of the Treasury department, payable in Treasury notes and greenbacks. Our internal revenue taxes may be paid in any forms of our money or currency; so that, as a matter of fact, there is no possibility of exacting from the taxpayers a single dollar in gold to be put into the Federal Treasury under our present system of taxation. No gold can be procured, by way of taxation, to meet the "gold demands," unless taxes are made payable specifically in gold and gold alone. Do our Republican friends intend to resort to such a drastic mode of taxation as this? If not, will they tell us how they propose to procure the gold, by way of taxation, to maintain the gold reserve? There is but one other way in which to maintain the reserve, and that is the method followed by Mr. Cleveland's administration—to wit, the sale of bonds from time to time for gold. But this

system the American people has condemned. There is another way by which it has been proposed to maintain the gold standard, that is to say, by the retirement of the greenbacks and Treasury notes, amounting to somewhere near \$500,000,000. But even this would probably fail, and the next demand would be to retire all full legal-tender silver money, and to make gold, and gold only, the sole legal tender in this country, and bank notes the only currency to supplement gold.

Mr. Cleveland insisted that the treasury notes and greenbacks should be refunded into bonds, or the bonds sold for the purpose of redeeming and cancelling these paper issues, but the Congress of the United States refused to conform to these recommendations. Will the Republican party undertake to retire Treasury notes and greenbacks, and thus take from circulation what Mr. Sherman and Mr. Carlisle have both denominated "gold demands"? The natural way to maintain the gold reserve would be the retirement of all paper issues redeemable in gold, for this would so contract the currency of this country as to reduce prices below the level of prices of the world, and thus induce a flow of gold to this country to buy property and commodities, because they could be bought cheaper here than elsewhere. In other words, by still lowering our prices, we could make gold more valuable here than elsewhere. The difficulty of entering upon such a policy, however, is that the American people would rebel against it. They would not long maintain in power a political party that had entered upon so drastic a course. So that we can see no relief whatever to come to the people of this country by the election of Mr. McKinley.

But, even if the Republican party should undertake to carry out any of the policies indicated, it would be powerless to do so. Mr. McKinley's election would not mean that he could secure the passage of any tariff bill, nor could he secure any legislation upon the currency question, for the simple reason that the Senate, as now constituted, and as it will remain constituted, will be a barrier to any policy foreshadowed in the St. Louis platform. The country well knows that the Republican tariff bill, passed by the Republican House of Representatives in the last session of Congress, was defeated in the Senate by Republican votes; and the people know that no tariff bill, that no bill for the issue of bonds, and no bill upon the lines laid down in the St. Louis platform,

could pass the Senate during Mr. McKinley's administration if he were elected. He would be utterly helpless as President, and would simply find himself occupying the same position Mr. Cleveland has occupied during his present administration. There would be nothing left for Mr. McKinley but to pursue the policy followed by Mr. Cleveland—to wit, the issuing of bonds from time to time to procure gold with which to maintain the gold standard. And the very men who are now, for political effect, refraining from drawing gold from the Federal Treasury, in order to secure the election of Mr. McKinley, would be the first to rob the Treasury of its gold the moment it ascertained the Republicans had been victorious in the November election. Yet these are the men who denounce the Democratic platform for dishonesty.

The question then arises, Are we to have, and ought we to have, a change from the present conditions? Are the people satisfied with the hard times now in this country? Are they prepared to say that they would prefer the continuation of the present administration, or of an administration that would pursue the same policy as that of Mr. Cleveland, or do they desire a change? If they wish a change, there is but one method in which to secure it. That mode is pointed out in the Democratic platform adopted at Chicago.

We propose to base our system of finances upon the well-tried doctrine of bimetallism. We declare that our bonded debt, that the greenback and Treasury notes, and all other forms of government paper payable in coin, are payable in gold or silver, at the option of the government, and not at the option or pleasure of those holding government obligations. We insist that this government is strong enough to pursue the policy that is followed to-day by the Bank of France, which is, to pay gold or silver at the option of the Treasury and thus to bring silver into use as an aid to gold, and in this way to obviate the necessity of any further bond issues to maintain coin redemptions. And as a means of supplying our people with a currency we propose to go back to the old system that was followed by this government during eighty years of Democratic rule, with open mints to the free coinage of gold and silver, as was our policy prior to 1873. This will give us a system of currency that will be adequate in volume, and stable, as compared to all other things. This we propose to do without the aid or consent of any other nation.

We insist that this country is abundantly able to maintain a financial system of its own. The Republican party, in its St. Louis platform, confesses that bimetallism is preferable to gold monometallism, but demands the maintenance of the gold standard until international agreement can be had looking to the establishment of bimetallism throughout the world. The people of the United States have become impatient upon the question of international bimetallism. For more than twenty years the argument of international bimetallism has loomed up to thwart the hopes of the American people upon this subject. It has been interjected into every campaign and been made a stumbling block to every step looking towards the restoration of silver by the American people. They will no longer be fooled in this way. We must either establish bimetallism for ourselves or surrender the fight and content ourselves with the single gold standard for all time.

The people of the United States, while not so large in population as are France and Germany and Great Britain combined, yet constitute nearly 75,000,000 people, with productive power as great as all three of the nations named. We have a commercial power equal to theirs. And besides all this, we are a nation comparatively new, with an immense territory yet to be developed, and with enterprises to be entered upon far exceeding the resources of all Europe combined.

In other words, if the nations of Europe combined could maintain a bimetallic standard, the United States can do so alone; for our commercial power and our needs for money are as great as those of the principal countries of Europe combined. The demands of this country for silver would equal or exceed the demands for silver as money, by France, England, and Germany together; and yet in the face of this fact, well known by sensible people, the advocates of the single gold standard insist that under the free coinage of silver favored by the Chicago platform, the demand for silver by the people of this country would not cause its value to appreciate, as compared with gold. No man in his senses but can see that should our government cease its great demand for gold, which now exists under the single gold standard, and throw its power upon the side of silver, making its demand for silver instead of gold, such a condition would inevitably lower the value of gold and appreciate that of

silver, thus bringing the two metals to practical parity in this country, and throughout the world. Whatever value we should give to silver at our mints, that metal would obtain the world over. No matter where silver might be, it would there command the same price it would have in the United States, less the cost of transportation; for no man would take less for his silver, anywhere in the world, than he could procure for it at our mints. And hence, instead of silver coming here to be coined, as is insisted by the advocates of the single gold standard, silver would perform monetary duty throughout the world, at the value fixed upon it by our mints. It would remain in the various countries where needed, and pass at the monetary value fixed in the United States.

Under a system of bimetallism there would be no difficulty whatever of maintaining all forms of our currency at par with coin. There would be no necessity for contracting our currency, or destroying the greenbacks or Treasury notes. They would circulate everywhere as the representatives of coin, and of equal value with coin.

Under such a system of currency there would be a revival of business throughout the land, that would cause money to flow into our Treasury in amounts sufficient to meet all demands. Under our system of taxation on consumption, taxation may decrease as consumption decreases under stress of hard times and scarcity of work. A revival of business activities would necessarily largely increase consumption, and this increased consumption would swell the money flowing into the Treasury.

There would be no scramble for gold, for silver would answer all the purposes of gold.

The stock of silver coin and bullion now in the Treasury, together with the coin that would come into the Treasury by way of taxation, would at all times be sufficient to meet our coin obligations, thus obviating the necessity for continued sales of bonds for resumption purposes.

R. P. BLAND.